Mysore on March 25th, 1952. The first few weeks everything went off as usual. But towards the close of June and in July a series of events began to take place, on the political plane and the personal plane, that has led gradually to the development of bitter and acrimonious sickness in the public life of the State. It was from July 1952 that relations with the Chief Minister began to get strained.

The Chief Minister began the conversation by saying that Mr. Veeranna Gowda withdrew all the allegations made against him and his ministry. He said he commanded absolute majority in the Legislative Assembly and his power was unshakable: he commanded popular support and respect. He further added, there is a strong rumour current in Bangalore that Your Highness is backing up and supporting the dissenting elements of the Congress Party in the State: that Your Highness is financially supporting the dissidents and was responsible for sending the group of Congress people (the K.P.C.C. President and others) to Delhi, that large amounts of money were spent by me to keep up the opposition to the present Ministry in office.

He further alleged that as Rajpramukh I was divulging all State secrets to the dissident group in the Congress, that I was not supporting the Government in power, as I should constitutionally do, but encouraging the opposite faction within the Congress Party, that I was dominated and influenced greatly by Mr. S. Chennaiah who was in the Chief Minister's opinion an undesirable character, as well as Messrs. Dasappa and Medappa, who were being unduly consulted and interviews being granted to them, were all to the distaste of the Chief Minister, as they were all prejudiced against the present Chief Minister. He also said that I should notify Government, of the people I see, so that nobody could be interviewed without Government knowledge. He further stated this was the rumour strongly

current in Bangalore and several M.Ps had repeated it to him. His mind was greatly agitated over this and he was asking me for a clarification and denial of this report.

I replied by saying that I was painfully surprised and shocked (to put it very mildly) at the very rash and unfounded statements made by the Chief Minister, supported by rumour. I denied all the allegations made, because I was perfectly confident I had done nothing wrong or unconstitutional. I have made it my principle to be severely aloof from politics and political parties; therefore it was all the more shocking to be accused of taking sides in the internal rift of the Congress Party of Mysore, and graver still, to be accused of financing the opposition within the party. Surely I said this was a very serious charge and I could not allow my name to be besmirched like this, especially when the allegations made were based on purely rumour and hearsay. I told the Chief Minister I deny the whole affair and reminded him of my intention to support whichever ministry in power, in the interests of Mysore. Mysore is Paramount, everything else being subordinate. I told him I cannot make things clearer than this. It was up to him to accept it or leave it. As for the interviews to various people, I said it was my right to see and meet anyone I wish and no ministry could interfere with that. The Chief Minister said he did not dispute that, but that I should avoid undesirable people. I told him, for me there was no question of desirable or undesirable. Being neutral I was bound to see anybody or everybody who wished to see me, and as often as I feel necessary. That should not be construed, as the Chief Minister tried to construe it, as an attempt to disregard the ministry. My contact with all would, in the long run, be of help to the Ministry. It was up to them to make use of my information and knowledge on various men and matters. If they did not do so, I for one, would not

volunteer the information. I said, a great deal could be done by the genuine display of mutual regard and esteem. Therefore, I again repeated I could not accept any limitation on my personal liberty and right in seeing and discussing matters with anyone I wished. I told the Chief Minister that my relations with the people I saw and my conduct as a whole was above reproach and I greatly resented this insinuation which was nothing but an ill-founded attempt to blaspheme my character and integrity.

I am of the impression that the Chief Minister is bent on doing everything in his power to embarass me and hurl a series of pin-pricks through ..... and the crafty use of alleged rumours and hearsays of un-named M.L.A and others convenient for him to make use of. I record this, because the Chief Minister told me that I should correct my conduct and behave better, that is, observe the constitutional procedure. If I did not do so, consequences would be fatal and disastrous. As I told him, my reply was, I have done my best to be helpful and useful. More than this I cannot do nor am I prepared to humiliate myself into the position of being the Chief Minister's henchman in politics. I have always believed that the position of a Rajpramukh is to be neutral, to take no sides, to be loved by all, to be consulted by all for advice and guidance. He should be the custodian of the State's best interests in the long run. As Sir William Anson puts it (here, speaking of the British Sovereign): " Such a personage cannot be treated as a mere instrument; it is evident that on all matters of State .... he receives full information and is able to express, if not enforce, an opinion. And this opinion in the course of a long reign may become a thing of the great weight and value. It is impossible to be constantly consulted and concerned for years together in matters of great moment without acquiring experience, if not wisdom." It is such

a useful role that a Head of the State should play.